Serial No. 09/641,730   16
Docket No. 5-006US-FF
(USH.013)

REMARKS

Entry of this Amendment is proper because it does <u>not</u> raise any new issues requiring further search by the Examiner, narrows the issues on appeal, **and is believed to place the present application in condition for immediate <u>allowance</u>.**

Claims 1-9 and 11-29 are all the claims presently pending in the application.

I.   ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Applicant gratefully acknowledges that **claim 30** would be **allowable** if rewritten in independent form, including all of the features of the base claim and intervening claim.

While Applicant believes that all of the claims are patentable over the cited references, <u>to speed prosecution</u>, independent claim 1 is amended to incorporate the features of <u>allowable</u> claim 30 and intervening claim 10 (i.e., claims 1+10+30), thereby placing claims 1-5, 10, 11, 13-17, and 22-29 in condition for immediate <u>allowance</u>. Claims 10 and 30 correspondingly have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Applicant also amends independent claims 6-9, 12, and 18 to incorporate somewhat similar features as <u>allowable</u> claim 30 and intervening claim 10. Applicant submits that such amendments also should place <u>claims 6-9, 12, and 18-21</u> in condition for immediate <u>allowance</u>.

<u>For the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that claims 1-9 and 11-29 (all the claims presently pending in the application) should be in condition for immediate allowance.</u>

It is noted that the claim amendments are made only for more particularly pointing out the invention, and <u>not</u> for distinguishing the invention over the prior art, narrowing the claims or for any statutory requirements of patentability. Further, Applicant

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Serial No. 09/641,730   17
Docket No. 5-006US-FF
(USH.013)

specifically states that no amendment to any claim herein should be construed as a

disclaimer of any interest in or right to an equivalent of any element or feature of the

amended claim.

II.   THE CLAIMED INVENTION

The claimed invention is directed to a data communication system.

By transmitting the <u>font information data</u> representing the fonts, which have been

found by the font search unit, <u>to the client computer</u>, the claimed invention enables the

user of the client computer to use only those fonts that are capable of being printed by the

server when creating documents to be transmitted to the server for printing.

In other words, by transmitting the font information data representing the fonts

which have been found by the font search unit to be capable of both display on the client

computer and printing on the server, the user is informed of which fonts (from the fonts

stored on the user's computer) to use when creating a document to ensure that the server

is capable of printing the document. In this way, <u>the user can easily create documents</u>

<u>using their own computer and transmit those documents to the server</u> for printing by a

high-quality printer for delivery to the user via mail, <u>while having confidence that the</u>

<u>printed version of the ordered documents will correspond to the documents created using</u>

<u>the client computer</u> (e.g., see specification at page 17, lines 13).

III.   THE PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

Claims 1, 4-10, 12, and 16-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being

anticipated by Carter, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,675,357). Claims 2, 3, 14, and 15 stand

Serial No. 09/641,730   18
Docket No. 5-006US-FF
(USH.013)

rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carter in view of Flowers,

et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,533,174); claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Carter in view of Cedar, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,256,650); and

claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carter in

view of Yacoub (U.S. Patent No. 6,452,692).

A.   Claims 1-5, 10, 11, 13-17, and 22-29:

As mentioned above, while Applicant believes that _all_ of the claims are patentable

over the cited references, to speed prosecution, independent claim 1 is amended to

incorporate the features of **allowable** claim 30 and intervening claim 10 (i.e., claims

1+10+30).

Thus, Applicant submits that the rejections of claims 1, 4, 5, 10, 16, 17, and 22-29

under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) by Carter, claims 2, 3, 14, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over

Carter in view of Flowers, claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Carter in view of

Cedar, and claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Carter in view of Yacoub, have been

rendered moot by the amendment to independent claim 1, since these claims are patentable at

least by virtue of their dependency from independent claim 1 (i.e., _allowable_ claim

1+10+30).

Therefore, the Examiner is requested to withdraw the rejections of these claims and to

permit claims 1-5, 10, 11, 13-17, and 22-29 to pass to immediate _allowance_.

B.   Claims 6-9, 12, and 18-21:

With respect to claims 6-9, 12, and 18-21, Applicant notes that these claims stand

rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Carter.

Serial No. 09/641,730   19
Docket No. 5-006US-FF
(USH.013)

As mentioned above, while Applicant believes that <u>all</u> of the claims are patentable over the cited references, <u>to speed prosecution,</u> Applicant also amends independent claims 6-9, 12, and 18 to incorporate somewhat similar features as <u>allowable</u> claim 30 and intervening claim 10.

Applicant submits that claims 6-9, 12, and 18-21 should now be in condition for immediate allowance.

That is, Applicant submits that Carter clearly does <u>not</u> disclose or suggest all of the features of independent claims 6-9, 12, and 18, as amended.

For example, independent claim 6 recites, *inter alia,* a client computer:

> *wherein said reporting unit comprises <u>a font name display</u>*
> *<u>device</u> that displays a font name represented by the font information*
> *data transmitted from said second font transmitting unit of said server,*
> *and*
> *wherein said receiving unit <u>receives said font information data</u>*
> *<u>representing the fonts</u>, which have been found by said server, from said*
> *server <u>for display by said font name display device</u> of said client*
> *computer to a user <u>such that said user can selectively create documents</u>*
> *<u>using said fonts which have been determined to be stored on said client</u>*
> *<u>computer, which have been determined to be capable of being output at</u>*
> *<u>said client computer, and which have been determined to be capable of</u>*
> *<u>being output at said server</u>* (emphasis added).

According to the claimed invention, by transmitting the font information data representing the fonts which have been found by the font search unit to be capable of both display on the client computer and printing on the server, the user is informed of which fonts (from the fonts stored on the user's computer) to use when creating a document to ensure that the server is capable of printing the document using the selected font. In this way, <u>the user can easily create documents using their own computer and</u> <u>transmit those documents to the server</u> for printing by a high-quality printer for delivery to the user via mail, <u>while having confidence that the printed version of the ordered</u>

documents will correspond to the documents created using the client computer (e.g., see

specification at page 17, lines 13).

In comparison, Carter merely discloses a "print job" which is defined by Carter as

"a request from a client to output to a particular hard copy device a set of graphical

primitive commands" (see Carter at column 5, lines 61-63; emphasis added).

That is, Carter merely provides a method of controlling printing through a

graphical user interface in which the user or administrator can select and/or configure a

font-matching scheme to enhance the quality and performance of printing (see Carter at

column 5, lines 35-42). In contrast to the claimed invention, Carter relates to an

apparatus and method for controlling printing, and more particularly, for allowing the

association of a logical font with a number of system fonts or device fonts on a per

printer queue basis (e.g., see Carter at column 2, lines 15-23).

For example, in Figure 6, the client "print job" is received (e.g., step 600) and then

the queue processor retrieves the Java font associations (e.g., step 606) and matches the

Java font to font GUI associated font (e.g., step 608)(e.g., see Carter at column 7, lines

46-64). In other words, the file to be printed (e.g., the client "print job") already has been

created, such that Carter provides a method of font-matching to the fonts already used in

the document.

In comparison, in the claimed invention, the user can easily create documents

using their own computer and transmit those documents to the server for printing by a

high-quality printer for delivery to the user via mail, while having confidence that the

printed version of the ordered documents will correspond to the documents created using

the client computer (e.g., see specification at page 17, lines 13).

Serial No. 09/641,730   21
Docket No. 5-006US-FF
(USH.013)

Applicant submits that Carter clearly does <u>not</u> disclose or suggest at least "*<u>a font</u>*

<u>name display device</u> that displays a font name represented by the font information data

transmitted from said second font transmitting unit of said server, <u>wherein said receiving</u>

<u>unit receives said font information data representing the fonts, which have been found by</u>

<u>said server, from said server for display by said font name display device of said client</u>

<u>computer to a user such that said user can selectively create documents using said fonts</u>

<u>which have been determined to be stored on said client computer, which have been</u>

<u>determined to be capable of being output at said client computer, and which have been</u>

<u>determined to be capable of being output at said server</u>" (emphasis added).

Thus, claim 6 clearly is <u>not</u> anticipated by, or rendered obvious from, Carter.

Applicant submits that claims 7-9, 12, and 18 also recite somewhat similar

features as allowable claim 30 (i.e., claim 1+10+30). Thus, claims 7-9, 12, and 18 also

are <u>not</u> anticipated by, or rendered obvious from, Carter for somewhat similar reasons as

those set forth above.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that Carter clearly does <u>not</u> disclose or

suggest all of the features of independent claims 6-9, 12, and 18.

Thus, Carter clearly does <u>not</u> anticipate, or for that matter render obvious, all of the

features of claims 6-9, 12, and 18-21. Claims 6-9, 12, and 18-21 should now be in condition

for immediate allowance.

IV.   **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claims 1-9 and 11-29, all the

claims presently pending in the application, are patentably distinct over the prior art of

Serial No. 09/641,730   22
Docket No. 5-006US-FF
(USH.013)

record and are in condition for <u>allowance</u>. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass

the above application to issue at the earliest possible time.

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for

allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone

number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary in a telephonic or

personal interview.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in fees or to

credit any overpayment in fees to Attorney's Deposit Account No. 50-0481.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: _September 7, 2005_

John J. Drosch, Esq.
Registration No. 46,672

Sean M. McGinn, Esq.
Registration No. 34,386

MCGINN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
** LAW GROUP, PLLC**
8321 Old Courthouse Road, Suite 200
Vienna, Virginia 22182-3817
(703) 761-4100
Customer No. 21254

CERTIFICATION OF TRANSMISSION

I certify that I transmitted the enclosed Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 to
Examiner Benjamin R. Bruckart, Art Unit 2155, via facsimile to (571) 273-8300 on
September 7, 2005.

John J. Drosch, Esq.
Registration No. 46,672
Sean M. McGinn, Esq.
Registration No. 34,386